DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 790 CS 500 710

AUTHOR Harms, L. S.
TITLE Communication Rights of Mankind: Present and Future.
PUB DATE Jul 73
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Summer Conference of the Speech Communication Association (9th, Chicago, July 12-14, 1973); Also in "Proceedings" published by Speech Communication Association, edited by R. Jeffrey and W. Work, pp. 158-63

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Civil Rights; *Communication (Thought Transfer); Cultural Factors; Higher Education; Human Relations; *Information Systems; *Needs; *Research Problems

ABSTRACT

The right of man to communicate is likely to be a concern of the Speech Communication Association for some time to come. The communication era promises to unfold in the period from 1970 to 2020--the next five decades. The communications models of the future will emphasize both transmitting and receiving capacities and will be concerned with the effects of communication between cultures, including future shock, cultural shock, and communication shock. The specification of communication needs would be useful to the engineer who designs the communications technology, the statesman who shapes the policy, and the educator who designs the curricula that anticipate the future of human communication. (RB)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 091790

CONFERENCE LUNCHEON ADDRESS

"Communication Rights of Mankind: Present and Future"

L. S. Harms
University of Hawaii

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Speech Communication Association

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

Chicago held a very special place in my boyhood puzzlements. As you can perhaps still hear in the way I talk, I grew up out in the country in South Dakota. For my first eight years of "learning," I attended what now appears to have been an avant-garde and subversive, old-fashioned, one-room country school. By Dakota standards, we lived within easy walking distance of that school, it was only about a mile down the road, and between our homestead and the school lay the Chicago and Northwestern railroad tracks. On a lucky day, a long, slow freight would emerge out of the horizon and block our path for a time. We'd wave at the engineer, the hobos in the box cars, the few hardy travelers in the passenger car, and the man in the caboose. Usually, a few crows would perch on the telephone and telegraph lines and join us in our train-watching.

Just among us boys, we were pretty sure there was a Chicago, and that the train did come from there. But we weren't really certain about that because we always wondered what happened down-line where the railroad tracks seemed to run together and the telephone poles seemed to sink into the ground. On a day made eventful by the passing of a train, we'd arrive late for school, and to lift the shroud of silent disapproval that a country school teacher often draped over misbehaving boys, we countered with out best and brightest questions. I still remember the answers. Yes, of course, the tracks extended to Chicago. No, she didn't know anyone who had ever taken the train to Chicago. Yes, of course, both the telephone and telegraph lines stretched all the way to Chicago. No, she had never got a telegram from anyone in Chicago or phoned there; didn't know anyone who had either. In the days of my early boyhood, Chicago was an unimaginable place -- somewhere out there beyond the morning mist of the prairie horizon.

Many of you, also, grew up out in the country or in small towns within a radius of a few hundred miles of Chicago. Quite naturally, the professional Association we form has its roots deep in the good earth of mid-West America. After harvest-time last September, a few of us met out in the country at Airlie House to consider the future of our Association, to inquire what our priorities should be, and to plan how these priorities or goals might be met. As you know, the Airlie House group recommended -- and our Association approved -- a challenging set of goals. Among these recommendations, as a highest priority long-range goal, was the simple but comprehensive: To Advance the Right of Man to Communicate. It is this goal that I would like to talk to you about today for our Association has placed that Right to Communicate goal on its formal agenda and it is likely to remain an item of unfinished business for a considerable time.

When we speak of a long-range goal, we are speaking of a span of time longer than the productive life of a professional person in our field, but not longer than the productive

CS 500 710

life of our professional Association; in other words, more than five decades, perhaps a century or more. When we wish to look a half century down our country road and on into the future, it is useful to reconsider a similar span of time in the past -- and to create thereby a time-umbrella over the present.

In looking again at the half century past of our Association, we note that it was first organized as the National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking (here in Chicago on a Saturday afternoon) in 1914; subsequently, it was transformed into the National Association of the Teachers of Speech, then, the Speech Association of America, and most recently, the Speech Communication Association. Each of these transformations extended the time and space dimensions of our Association. And our circle of concerns continues to widen. For as you recall, another major goal out of the Airlie House conference was that the Association again plans to reorganize and transform itself. Even though at times we seem to move slower than a freight train in South Dakota, our Association has been and continues to be a dynamic and adaptive one.

I mention the re-organization goal along with the Right to Communicate goal because they are interdependent. Individually, and as an Association, we have taken the train, found that the railroad tracks do not come together at the horizon, and have finally arrived in Chicago. But once in Chicago, we now discover that Chicago is not the end of the line but is rather a switching center, a node in a global communication network. It is this enlarged reality, interlinked by Chicago and the other world cities, that prompts a reorganization of our Association and encourages us to advance the Right of all of us -- the now nearly four billion of us -- to Communicate with each other. Our circle of concerns grows ever wider.

To guide us in our journey beyond Chicago, we listen with profit to a man who contributed much in Chicago and elsewhere in the world. I refer to Adlai Stevenson who once said that what America needs is a good hearing aid. When you travel outside the U.S. you will hear and see what he meant. But it was at Geneva during the final sentences of what was to be his last speech that he caught the spirit -- the tone and the perspective -- for that which is yet to come. Stevenson said:

> "We travel together, passengers on a little space ship, dependent on its vulnerable reserves of air and soil; all committed for our safety to its security and peace; preserved from annihilation only by the care, the work, and, I will say, the love we give our fragile craft."

This spaceship earth perspective still stretches familiar notions beyond comfortable limits for most of us. I'm not a member of the flat earth society even though I grew up on some of the world's flattest lands, and I've been around the world twice, but I expect to continue to feel uneasy when I fly off the edge of the Mercator map out of Delhi, and to feel relief when I arrive at a destination on the other side. By the way, is Delhi closer by air to Sydney or Singapore -- or to Hong Kong where this Association elected not to go to for an annual convention a few years ago? Or to bring these questions of time and space a bit closer to home, when Bill Work phoned a few weeks ago to ask if I could make the 4,000 mile trip to Chicago for this meeting, the conver-

sation began like this: "Hello, Stan. This is Bill Work. What time is it?" "Eight o'clock." Pause. "Did you just get up?" "No." Perhaps you notice the clever way he avoided asking whether it was morning or evening. Bill's call was balanced by a good friend phoning in from Tokyo to let me know he was coming to Honolulu. Naturally, his first question was "What day is it there?"

To complete our spaceship earth orientation, let me ask a simple question that John Bystrom's group deals with routinely in the course of operating the PEACESAT Project (PanPacific Educational and Communication Experiments by Satellite). If it is twelve noon on Wednesday in Honolulu, what hour and what day is it in Suva, Fiji or Wellington, New Zealand?

By contrast to that still awkward spaceship earth perspective, the Right to Communicate concept seems comfortably simple. Professionals in our field can with enthusiasm say, "That's a good idea. I'm for it. I'd like to advance the Right of Man to Communicate." I share your commitment, of course. But our good intentions tend to be culture bound, to spring from within the value system of a single culture, to grow from the soil within the circle of Chicago. To clarify what I mean, permit me to start again at the beginning.

First of all, spaceship earth is not yet finished. From time to time, volcanic eruptions add new earth to existing island . And occasionally, new island emerge from the bottom of the sea. Assume a recently formed volcanic island in PEACESAT and Pan Am territory somewhere in the South Pacific. To make you an omniscient and detached observer, I would like to put you in Skylab, and bestow upon you the powers of a Greek Daedalus by giving you total power to observe, study, and control human communication on that island.

So, you are in Skylab, and as you begin your observations of your Pacific Eden, there are two and only two persons on this island and you immediately recognize them. They are the man and woman who have their pictures on the Pioneer 10 plaque. Let's be Christian about this and name them Adam and Eve.

When you first look in on Adam and Eve, you discover that they are engaged in an activity that has occupied all men and all women for several hours every day of the human lifetime. They are engaged in conversation; they are talking to each other; they are communicating. For a few minutes, the conversation goes smoothly. Abrubtly, Adam stands up and walks away. Eve says, "But Adam, I..." At this decision point, the question of Communication Rights begins to emerge. Does Adam have the Right to terminate communication? If so, under what conditions. Most simply, does he have a Right Not to Communicate? Is it conditional, or unrestricted? Does Eve have a Right to compel Adam to continue communicating? If her need to communicate is great enough? Even if it is extremely punishing for Adam to continue communicating?

In your Daedalus-like wisdom, suppose you conclude that this question of Rights can be neatly solved by adding more possibilities. For Eve, you build an airport and arrange for regularly scheduled air service, and make the island a world tourist center. She will then have a wide variety of different persons to talk with. For Adam

to keep him happy, you give a PEACESAT ground station and arrange for him to discover that he can now communicate with anyone else in the entire world. But one day, as Adam is communicating, he happens to mention that he and Eve descended directly from the sun -- as some Pacific peoples believed -- and that he knows how to regulate human population growth -- as some early Pacific peoples apparently did. Immediately, Adam is flooded with questions and requests, and invitations to fly to distant places to make speeches. Abruptly, unexpectedly, one day he goes blank, experiences communication overload, communication shock. Even if Adam has special information of high value to all mankind, does Adam have the Right to withdraw from communication before he disables himself? More directly, how might Communication Rights at the individual, the community and the world interfaces be brought into harmony?

When we consider the fundamental questions of Communication Rights for even an isolated dyadic communication system, and add in the communicator linking capacity of the present-day worldwide transportation and telecommunication networks, we find that we require a spaceship earth perspective. As Stevenson said, "We travel together..., we share the fragile resources..." of our little spaceship. And among the most fragile of these resources is our human capacity for communication.

In my introductory comments, I have tried to suggest that if we choose to advance the Right of Man to Communicate, at times, we will need to lift our eyes and hearts from the flat earth of mid-West America, look beyond Chicago as Stevenson did, and work to preserve the fragile craft on which we live out our multifold, multicultural and mutual Odyssey.

What I wish to say next is divided into three major parts and a summary -- an organizational arrangement which should be surprise-free for everyone here! First, within a Stevenson sized spaceship earth, I would like to sketch out what the British Socio-Economist, Robert Theobald, now calls the Communication Era. Second, within the whole earth perspective of that Communication Era, I will raise questions about present and future communication needs. Third, I will expand on the fundamental questions that cluster around our Communication Rights goal. In the summary, I will outline some of the projects that are now underway and ask that you join us in our endeavors.

Communication Era

At about the time in 1965 when Stevenson spoke of spaceship earth, Al Toffler began to use the term future-shock to describe that condition where change occurs faster and on a larger scale than even before, and Daniel Bell began to see that such a rapid, large-scale change was leading on to a post-industrial society. The term post-industrial is obviously a temporary one similar to "horseless carriage" or the "wireless." In the same time-span, Robert Theobald became interested in what he called the transition from the Industrial Era to the Communication Era. I find Theobald's Communication Era framework useful in thinking about Communication Rights and the futures of human communication and hope that you will too.

I expect that Toffler, Bell and Theobald would agree that we should not only anticipate alternative futures, but that we also live in alternative presents. The present is a time of alternative or multiple eras, a time of cultural diversity. The 10,000 year

Agricultural Era still dominates many of the communities of the world especially in rural India. The 200 year long Industrial Era is just beginning in some communities in China and is winding down in some communities in Europe. Some communities may leap-frog directly from the Agricultural Era to the Communication Era, as some island communities of the Pacific are now doing. Of course, each of these Eras has characteristic communication structures and patterns. I would now like only to sketch out some of the time and space dimensions of the Communication Era.

The Communication Era promises to unfold in the period from 1970 to 2020, in other words, in the next five decades. The virtuoso communication display of the Apollo 11 moon venture marks the beginning of this Era. The Communication Era will be superceded by the Post-Communication Era, most probably about the year 2020, when contact is made with intelligent life from outer space. Lest this last assertion seem overly speculative at this time, permit me to remind you that the space probe, Pioneer 10, is on its way. Attached to it is the Adam and Eve plaque I referred to earlier, and that plaque carries a message from us earthlings. It also gives our earth address. No longer if, but rather when such contact is made between our civilization and a distant one, and communication is established, a renaissance can be anticipated. That renaissance will launch a Post-Communication Era -- I leave the probable characteristics of that new era to be puzzled out by that underused but unexcelled biocomputer you now carry around between your two ears.

But even when we severely limit ourselves to only this planet, the dimensions of the Communication Era may still exceed our mid-West horizons by an uncomfortable margin. Rather than overload you with charts, and photos and diagrams, I prefer to call on your imagination -- somewhat akin to that call in the thrilling days of yesteryear when the Lone Ranger and his compadres held forth in the theatre of the mind.

To begin, recall the sight of our blue planet as you first saw it suspended in space. Imagine communication satellites positioned in geostationary orbit at 22,300 miles above the equator. Then, imagine satellite ground stations, land lines, cable, telephone exchanges, broadcast stations, and an array of terminal equipment in offices and homes -- TV sets, radios, telephones, and their successors. Call all this interlinked hardware a world telecommunication network. Similarly, imagine a network composed of jetliners, airports, highways, trains, buses, cars -- a world transportation communication network. The key symbols, as Arthur Clarke repeatedly points out, are the communication satellite and the jetliner. These two new items of technology have in a few short years, largely since 1965, forged two global communication networks. And these networks, increasingly provide the linking capacity to make it possible for any human to communicate with any one other, or several, or many humans on the face of this earth.

For the most part we humans still communicate intensively with persons who are nearby and well-known. But over the years, we begin to communicate with each other less face-to-face, and more over the telephone and through the broadcast media. Significantly, we begin to allocate a higher proportion of our communication day to intercultural communication -- communication with a variety of strangers who live at a distance. Prophetically, both the satellite and jet are increasingly unaffected by earth surface distance. Spaceship earth shrinks and it is wired for human communication.

The spur of necessity stimulates the worldwide growth in intercultural and multicultural communication. The scale of our urgent human problems such as ocean pollution, population growth and skyjacking provide the obvious examples. Likewise, the desire to combine Western sciences and Eastern wisdoms prompts an East-West dialogue. To facilitate the solution of mutual problems and the development of mutual possibilities, communication is required -- and will further require mutual Communication Rights. Fortunately, just now, the two global networks provide a much increased capacity for linking human communicators.

As we imagine the sum of human communication on the whole earth, we envision a great space in which messages and communicators move about. This space, this communication space, if you will, has structures and patterns within it. Call these a communication infrastructure. That infrastructure encompasses the two great communication networks -- transportation and telecommunication, the policy that governs the growth and use of those networks, and the systems that human communicators organize for their own purposes -- which systems are in turn linked by the networks and governed by policy.

I shall have more to say about linkages in relation to rights. And, before moving to a discussion of communication needs, I would like to spend a few moments on time in the Communication Era.

As you know, our spaceship earth has a life expectancy of nine billion years; its present age is about 4.5 billion years. We humans appeared about four million years ago, and got into the communication business about half a million years ago. We are newcomers on a middle-aged planet.

About 500,000 years ago we numbered about ten million and nearly all of us learned to talk and listen. About five thousand years ago, we numbered about 75 million and a few of us learned to read and write. About five hundred years ago, we numbered about 400 million, the printing press was invented, a few of us wrote things that got printed, many copies were made, and many persons learned to read. Then, mostly within the last fifty years, telegraph, telephone, radio, TV, trains, cars and planes were invented, produced, and brought into use in various combinations by a growing percentage of the now nearly four billion of us. Many of the most important developments in human communication history have occured during the half century history of our Association.

As we consider the Communication Era for the whole of spaceship earth, then, we imagine a communication space. Within that space we detect a communication infrastructure. That infrastructure includes the two world communication networks, communication policies, four billion communicators with culture shaped attitudes, skills, and questions. The structure is real; the communication patterns are dynamic. The Communication Era will continue until about 2020 -- just after the centennial of our Association.

Within a Communication Era infrastructure, we can pose the critical question: At present and in the future, what must be the Communication Rights of Mankind?

Communication Needs.

At Airlie House during our discussions of the Right to Communication concept, Bob Kibler suggested that we try our hand at a Bill of Rights or a Declaration of the Rights of Man to Communicate. The Virginia air seems to stimulate such thoughts. Bill Howell and I worked out a very rough draft of such a Declaration -- we called it -3 because we finished it just before three in the morning. Back in Honolulu, I worked up another draft. By then it was becoming evident that there were two critical flaws in that direct approach. It was monocultural rather than multicultural in conception and development. And, we discovered we did not know with adequate precision what domain the Declaration of Rights should cover. Most basically, we know too little about the communication needs of man, of all four billion of us humans. We had ventured far from the circle of Chicago and we did not have a map.

As we move into a Communication Era, simultaneously experiencing future shock, culture shock, and communication shock, we are abruptly informed by the events around us that communication needs are changing. Until recently, we in this Association were in comfortable agreement about what the communication needs were, if not for all of mankind for at least that representative sample of humans that gathered in our classrooms. As the first name of our Association announced, above all else, we thought a young person needed to learn to stand before an audience and deliver a public speech. That was assumed to be a basic -- and in some cases, only -- communication need. A democracy needed people with just those communication skills: when it had them all would be well.

In the last few months, quite unambigously, we have found that not only do we not know enought at this time to draft a Declaration of Communication Rights, no other single cultural perspective, professional group, or institution can formulate such a document either. Consequently, we have set about forming Regional Study Groups and a World Council which I'll describe a bit later. The quest for a set of Communication Rights for all of us, will in the long-range, require inputs from a considerable percentage of Mankind. It is a grass-roots endeavor.

From this broad base, the Communication Rights questions lead in three directions: to communication technology, to communication policy, and most fundamentally; to human communication needs.

As a very rough first approximation, at least five partially culture-free areas can be named in which at least some of the communication needs of man may lie. These areas are intended only to be suggestive.

* Privacy Need Area. Need for rest, solitude, thought. Requires suitable architecture and community structure.

* Association Need Area. Need to assemble for a full range of communication purposes, with a suitable variety of other human communicators. Requires two-way communication in suitable social structures and two-way communication technologies.

* Information Need Area. Need for reliable information from easily accessible sources. Requires both personal and impersonal arrangements including mass media and user-activated information technologies.

* Environmental Monitoring Need Area. Need for timely alerts of both routine and emergency events. Requires suitable global monitoring system, a communication "ERTS."

* Synergy/Serendipty Need Areas. Need to participate in the creation and invention of new information. Requires two-way systems.

Permit me to repeat, these areas are intended as illustrative of some of the areas in which specific communication needs may be identified in a long-term, large-scale, worldwide attempt to build a multicultural specification of human communication needs.

We need to know more about communication needs before we can progress very far in our quest for communication rights. Also, such a specification of needs would be useful to the engineer who designs the technology and the statesman who shapes the policy -- and, of course, the educator who designs the curricula that anticipates the future of human communication in the Communication Era.

I urge you to direct some of your research efforts to a re-examination of fundamental communication needs. The results you obtain, the specifications you develop, will be very widely useful.

Communication Rights

As you know, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was approved by the United Nation's General Assumbly in December, 1948. Some of its thirty articles bear directly on human communication. Just how many of those articles depends on how we define communication. Recently, in re-examining Article 19, Jean d'Arcy remarked that it needed to be extended into a full-fledged Right to Communicate.

If we use a widespread Industrial Era definition of communication -- that is, a source transmitting information to a receiver, etc. -- then, only Article 19 applies with particular emphasis on the right..."to seek, receive, and impart (or transmit) information. But if we employ an emerging Communication Era definition -- that is, communicators engaged in information interchange to achieve a mutual purpose -- then, in addition to Article 19, Article 20 on association and Article 18 on personal thoughts also apply.

For the moment, take only the right to receive and impart information aspects of Article 19. Very few communicators have an equal right to receive and impart information. The technology we build, the policy we form, the communication attitudes and skill that develop now combine to create and to perpetuate a serious imbalance. Should, for instance, a Billy Graham have the right to impart his version of the "true word" via direct, worldwide satellite television -- if he can afford the cost? In particular, if only he can afford the cost? Even if people watching TV do not as a consequence continue to attend the small local churches that exist in each of the communities of the world. When we grant one man, or one organization, such as a government,

an extraordinary right to impart information, we to an important extent deprive other persons the right to impart information, and we decrease the available variety and diversity of information in the world.

I submit that you will find countless instances of a serious receive-impart imbalance. It began with the printing press and was amplified by radio and television broadcasting. That imbalance exists at all levels from the worldwide to the Adam-Eve dyad on an isolated island. That receive-impart imbalance is inherent in any source-receiver model of communication.

The direct result of a large scale receive-impart imbalance is Communication Imperialism -- unintended, inadvertent in most cases, I grant that, but nevertheless real as, for instance, the residents of Singapore know where 70% of their television offerings are from among those prepared for U.S. TV that you would not consider worth warching. The U.S., Europe, and now Japan are finding that they have become imperialists in the area of communication. This is one of things I suspect Adlai Stevenson had in mind when he said that what America needs is a hearing aid. A large scale talk-back capacity is urgently needed. The PEACESAT Project provides an instructive model for a large-scale, two-way, interactive, interchange system where talk-back is a central feature.

My point is that we -- and I mean now, you and me -- need communication rights quite as much as any other person or peoples do, including those poor persons in every community of the world (including your home town and mine), as well as those persons who live in the communication-poor communities in the developing regions of the world. Consider Vietnam, the Pentagon Papers, and Watergate. Because of the receive-impart imbalance that now exists, the task of developing Rights is difficult. It is also very important.

There are a number of steps that we can take now. I suggested the systematic study of communication needs. We can also examine the fragments of communication rights that now exist in the communities of the world as a means of getting a feel for what has been done, the dimensions of the question, the useful avenues to pursue. Region by region, we can meet in study groups. And, we can meet in world council.

Out of such deliberation and consultation might grow a revision and extension of selected Articles in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, or a new and independent Declaration of Communication Rights, or perhaps neither of these. In the Communication Era we may wish to write down only those agreements we wish to forget about. Communication Rights will be lived in moment by moment decisions across the billions of life spans of the entire Era. The Right of Man to Communicate is a real-time concept.

The Communication Era unfolds in an enormous infrastructure; that infrastructure promises to become the nervous system of mankind, the world brain, the noosphere. All of us have a vested interest in guiding such developments. The new realities we negotiate and Communication Rights we declare are inseparable from the quality, the quantity and variety of human communication. Communication Rights require new fundamentals for our field. Finally, if I understand what Bob Jeffrey has been saying in recent months, we also need a multi-cultural moral philosophy of human communication.

Our Association, as a long-range goal, seeks to advance the Right of Man to Communicate. As I said in my introduction, that goal is interdependent with our goal to reorganize the Association. As our Association pursues these goals and the other Airlie goals, it will change itself. Such change, I believe, will be for the better.

Summary

To summarize, I would like to list for you some of the Communication Rights Activities:

* The Airlie House Conference last September endorsed as a highest priority the long-range goal: To Advance the Right of Man to Communicate. It is hoped other communication associations around the world will do likewise and share their results with us.

* Our Association approved a Communication Rights Commission whose members are William Howell, Franklyn Haiman, Edward Stewart, Tom Tedford and myself. It is hoped other communication associations in the world will also form committees and commissions and that an "invisible College" arrangement can be developed among them. You can be of assistance in helping organize these committees.

* Communication Rights Seminars will be encouraged in many locations around the world, possibly satellite interconnected within the U.N. University framework. It would be helpful if you would encourage such seminars or courses in your own institutions or, better yet, undertake to offer them yourself.

* Communication Rights Regional Study Groups are being planned for early 19[illegible]. The first of these will cover the Americas Region and a second will center in the Pacific. The Study Groups will operate on the Airlie House discussion/dialog pattern.

* Communication Rights World Council has been proposed as a coordinating agency for a wide range of Communication Rights activities. We will keep you informed on developments here.

* Newsletter will be published. Please let me know if you would like to be on the mailing list.

As you recall, on this day, in 1965, Adlai Stevenson died on a London street of a heart attack. I would like to close by repeating the final paragraph of his last major public speech:

> "We travel together, passengers on a little space ship, dependent on its vulnerable reserves of air and soil; all committed for our safety to its security and peace; perserved from annihilation only by the care, the work, and, I will say, the love we give our fragile craft. We cannot maintain it half fortunate, half miserable, half confident, half despairing, half slave -- to the ancient enemies of man -- half free in a liberation of resources undreamed of until this day. No craft, no crew can travel safely with such vast contradictions. On their resolution depends the survival of us all."

Permit me to add that on spaceship earth human communication capacities are among the most vulnerable and valuable of our resources. Not only can we preserve our communication resources and ourselves from annihilation, we can -- because we choose to do so -- advance the Right of Man to Communicate.

Mahalo and Aloha.

P R O C E E D I N G S

Speech Communication Association
Summer Conference IX

Long Range Goals and Priorities in Speech Communication

Palmer House Hotel, Chicago, Illinois
July 12-14, 1973

Edited By
Robert C. Jeffrey
and
William Work

Speech Communication Association
Statler Hilton Hotel
New York, New York 10001

PREFACE

In September 1972, the Speech Communication Association sponsored a conference at Airlie House, Virginia to consider long-range goals and priorities for the Association and the profession. The seventeen conferees at the Airlie Conference generated a report (published in the April, 1973 issue of Spectra) that was widely discussed at the 1972 SCA Convention in December. The Legislative Council at that convention approved plans for the 1973 Summer Conference to expand upon the "Airlie Report."

The basic purpose of the Ninth Annual SCA Summer Conference was to extend the impact of the Airlie Conference by democratizing participation. The planners of the Conference predicted that those attending would contribute significantly to thought about the future of the profession by further defining goals, designing implementation strategies, and establishing priorities. To that end, all members of the SCA were invited to participate.

Since the "Airlie Report" presented recommendations in three broad areas—Education, Research, and Futurism—, the major divisions of the Conference were arranged to reflect those areas. Participants in Division A considered Education priorities, those in Division B dealt with Research priorities and those in Division C reflected on Futuristic priorities. Divisions A and B were each further organized into three Groups and Division C into two Groups. Participants, upon registering for the Conference, were asked to select the Division and Group in which he/she would like to participate. The Conference Program, reproduced in this report, sets out the sequence of events within the Groups and Divisions over the one and a half day conference.

The Division directors were asked to keep careful records of the deliberations within the Division, particularly of the recommendations and supporting rationales. They were also asked to collect any materials that were distributed to the Groups for reproduction in these Proceedings. Division Directors Ronald Allen and Lloyd Bitzer of the University of Wisconsin and Frank Dance of the University of Denver were diligent and aggressively original in planning for the work of the Divisions, and they were prompt in forwarding materials for publication. I am deeply indebted to them. The product of their labors and those of the Group chairmen forms the basis for this publication.

Major contributions were made to the Conference by Neil Postman of New York University who delivered a provocative and stimulating keynote address, and by L.S. Harms of the University of Hawaii, who concluded the conference with a look into the future, as the luncheon speaker. Transcripts of their addresses appear in these Proceedings.

The Director of the Conference is grateful to William Work, Executive Secretary of the SCA, for his efficiency in coordinating the efforts of many people who contributed to the Conference. The major kudos, however, go to the participants who generated the thought represented on the pages that follow.

Robert C. Jeffrey
Conference Director

PROGRAM
SCA SUMMER CONFERENCE IX

Palmer House, Chicago — July 12-14, 1973

Thursday Evening, July 12

8:00 pm	Keynote Address: Neil Postman, New York University
9:00 pm	No Host Reception

Friday, July 13

9:00 am	'The Airlie Conference,' First Vice-President Samuel L. Becker
9:15 a.m.	SCA Summer Conference IX Overview, President Robert C. Jeffrey
9:30-9:55 am	Organization of Conference Divisions
Division A:	Education Priorities, Ronald R. Allen, Director
Division B:	Research Priorities, Lloyd F. Bitzer, Director
Division C:	Futuristic Priorities, Frank E.X. Dance, Director
9:55-10:15 am	Coffee Break
10:15 am-12:15 pm	Division Groups Meet
A: Group 1:	Competency-Based Teacher Education, Gustav Friedrich, Chairman
Group 2:	Communication in the Secondary School Language Arts Curricula, Edward Pappas, Chairman
Group 3:	New Thrusts in Departmental Organization and the Preparation of Teachers, Barbara Lieb-Brilhart, Chairman
B: Group 1:	The Future of Communication Research, Gerald R. Miller, Chairman
Group 2:	Research Dealing with Models of Decision-Making, Kenneth E. Andersen, Chairman
Group 3:	Research on Problems of Freedom of Speech, Franklyn S. Haiman, Chairman
C: Group 1:	The Communication Needs & Rights of Mankind, L.S. Harms, Alton Barbour, Chairmen
Group 2:	Future Communication Technologies: Hardware and Software, William Conboy, Larry Wilder, & Jack Barwind, Chairmen
12:15-2:00 pm	Lunch Break
2:00-5:30 pm	Division Group Meetings Continue
8:00-10:30 pm	Optional Division Group Meetings

Saturday, July 14

9:00-10:40 am	Plenary Sessions: Divisions A, B, C.
10:40-11:00 am	Coffee Break
11:00-12:00 noon	Conference Plenary Session: Recommendations and Priorities
12:15-2:00 pm	Conference Luncheon Address: L.S. Harms, University of Hawaii, "The Communication Rights of Mankind: Present and Future"

Presiding at all General Sessions: Robert C. Jeffrey

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface — Robert C. Jeffrey, Conference Director. i

Keynote Address — Neil Postman. 1

Report of Division A: Education Priorities:

- Overview — R. R. Allen, Division Director. 10
- Group One Report: Input Phase Recommendations — Gustav W. Friedrich, Group Chairperson. . . . 10
- Group Two Report: Input Phase Recommendations — Edward J. Pappas, Group Chairperson. 12
- Group Three Report: Input Phase Recommendations — Barbara Lieb-Brilhart, Group Chairperson. . . 15
- Summary
- Appendix A: Commissioned Stimulus Statements on Competency-Based Teacher Education. 22
- Appendix B: Commissioned Stimulus Statements on Communication in Secondary School Language Arts Curricula. 50
- Appendix C: Commissioned Stimulus Statements on Implications of University Reorganization of Speech Departments for the Preparation of Secondary Communication Teachers. 85

Report of Division B: Research Priorities

- Overview — Lloyd F. Bitzer, Division Director. 120
- Group One Report: Recommendations — Gerald R. Miller, Group Chairperson. 121
- Group Two Report: Recommendations — Kenneth B. Andersen, Group Chairperson . . . 124
- Group Three Report: — Franklyn S. Haiman, Group Chairperson. . . . 128

Report of Division C. Futuristic Priorities

- Overview — Frank E.X. Dance, Division Director. 133
- Group One Report — Alton Barbour, Group Chairperson. 133
  - Priorities and Issues
  - Implementations
- Group Two Report: — William Conboy, Larry Wilder, Jack Barwind, Group Co-Chairpersons. . . . 135
  - General Statement
  - Priorities and Issues
  - Implementations
- Appendix: Prepared Materials and Bibliographies on Future Communication Technologies. 137

Luncheon Address: "The Communication Rights of Mankind: Present and Future" — L.S. Harms. 158